

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): D. Amnon Silverstein

Confirmation No.: 2174

Application No.: 09/843,755

Examiner: N. D. Nguyen

Filing Date: April 30, 2001

Group Art Unit: 9186

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR VIRTUAL OVERSIZED
DISPLAY USING A SMALL PANEL DISPLAY AS A MOBILE
USER INTERFACE

Mail Stop
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:

(X) Response/Amendment () Petition to extend time to respond
() New fee as calculated below () Supplemental Declaration
() No additional fee
() Other: _____ (fee \$ _____)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY						
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEES
TOTAL CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$18	\$ 0
INDEP. CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$86	\$ 0
[] FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM					+ \$280	\$ 0
EXTENSION FEE	1ST MONTH \$110.00	2ND MONTH \$420.00	3RD MONTH \$950.00	4TH MONTH \$1480.00		\$ 0
OTHER FEES						\$
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						\$ 0

Charge \$ 0 to Deposit Account 08-2025. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Amnon Silverstein

By

Patrick C. Keane

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,858

I hereby certify that this document is being filed by personal delivery to the Customer Service Window, Crystal Plaza 2, 2011 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia, of the United States Patent & Trademark Office on the date indicated above.

By Patrick C. Keane Reg. No. 32,858
(Attorney Signature and Reg. No.)

Date: August 16, 2004

O I P E
AUG 1 6 2004
U. S. Patent and Trademark Office
965

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)
D. Amnon Silverstein) Group Art Unit: 2174
Application No.: 09/843,755) Examiner: N.D. Nguyen
Filed: April 30, 2001) Confirmation No.: 9186
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR)
VIRTUAL OVERSIZED DISPLAY)
USING A SMALL PANEL DISPLAY)
AS A MOVABLE USER INTERFACE)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed June 15, 2004, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 remain pending in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-15 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,348,936 (Berteig). On page 4 of the Office Action, claim 16 is again rejected as being unpatentable over the Berteig patent in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,501,464 (Cobbley et al). On page 5 of the Office Action, claim 17 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the Berteig patent in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,359,615 (Singh). These rejections are respectfully traversed, despite the Examiner's attempt to support the rejection with the comments set forth on page 6 of the Office Action. None of the patent documents relied upon by the Examiner, in the

various combinations set forth in the Office Action, teach or suggest the combinations of features set forth in independent claims 1 and 10.

Page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner sets forth a response to Applicant's previous assertions that the display of the Berteig patent, the primary reference relied upon in the Office Action, is not described as being movable relative to a first surface. The Examiner appears to acknowledge that although the Berteig patent does not describe an apparatus that constitutes a movable display, this reference still reads on the language of independent claims 1 and 10. More particularly, the Examiner asserts on page 6 of the Office Action:

The Berteig reference still reads on the claim language of claims 1 and 10. Since "display" means "a presentation of something in open view" "movable display" can be interpreted as a movable presentation. In fig. 4 (col. 4, lines 6-34), navigating between position A and B can make the display document (or presentation) movable by jumping back and forth between pages 3 and 7 relative to the display monitor screen (first surface). Therefore, Berteig does teach "means for detecting movement of the movable display relative to a first surface".

The Examiner's attempt to broadly interpret the claim 1 apparatus, which is directed to a "movable display", as a "presentation of something in open view" is improper. The claim is directed to an apparatus which includes, among other features, a "means for detecting" and a "means for correlating". The "movable display" to which the claim is directed constitutes a movable device and, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, cannot be broadly construed as a movable image that represents a "presentation of something in open view". The Examiner's definition improperly corresponds to use of the term "display" as a verb, rather than as a noun as claimed.

Moreover, the dependent claims support an interpretation that the “movable display” of independent claims 1 and 10 constitutes an apparatus which is movable relative to a first surface. For example, each of the dependent claims 2-9 recite additional structural features of the claim 1 apparatus. Dependent claims 11-17 recite structural aspects of the claim 10 “movable display.” Thus, all of the claim limitations require a construction of the phrase “movable display” as an apparatus, which is movable relative to a first surface, a feature which is neither taught or suggested by the movable image of the Berteig patent.

Applicant's Figures 1A and 1B disclose an exemplary embodiment, wherein a “movable display”, such as movable display 100 is provided. The movable display 100 has a display screen 102, such as the display screen included in hand-held display apparatus such as the HP Jornada™. The movable display can be moved about a first surface 104, such as a table or other surface.

The movable display includes structural elements; namely, a means for detecting movement of the movable display relative to the first surface using, for example, a transducer 108. The detected movement of the movable display 100 relative to the surface is correlated to a position on a digitally stored image, such as the stored image of Figure 1A, so that information associated with that position can be extracted and presented on the display screen 102 of the movable display 102.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by Applicant's claim 1 which is directed to a “movable display”. The claim 1 apparatus recites means for detecting movement of the movable display **relative to the first surface**; and means for correlating movement of the movable display to information representing a portion of a first image stored in a database, and for presenting information on the

movable display. Such a combination of features is neither taught nor suggested by the Berteig patent, considered alone or in combination with the Cobbley or Singh patents.

Despite the Examiner's unsubstantiated assertions on page 6 of the Office Action, the Berteig patent is not even directed to an apparatus configured as a movable display. In the Office Action, the Examiner references the Figure 4 example of the Berteig patent as described at column 4, lines 6-34. This portion of the Berteig patent describes a movable image as a software icon, represented as a slider 415 of Figure 4. The slider 415 is presented within the display as an image of a rectangular box, which is vertically movable up and down along the scroll bar 410 within the displayed information. The height of the slider 415 relative to the top and bottom of the scroll bar 410, which is also presented as an image within the display, corresponds to a relative page position within a word processing document displayed within the document display window 405.

Thus, the Berteig patent does not teach or suggest an apparatus configured as a movable display, nor does this document teach or suggest any means for detecting movement such as a **movable display relative to a first surface**. The display device of the Berteig patent is not described as being movable relative to a first surface. Rather, at best, the slider 415 is an image that is moved within the display region, and is therefore moved **within** the first surface. Because the slider 415 is included in the display, there is no correlation of movement of a movable display to information representing a portion of the first image stored in a database. As such, the Berteig patent fails to teach or suggest features of Applicant's claim 1.

Claim 10 is directed to a method for displaying information related to a physical document and includes, among other features, detecting movement of a movable display relative to a first surface. Claim 10 also recites correlating movement of the movable display to information representing a portion of a first image stored in a database, and presenting the information on a movable display. For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, claim 10 is neither taught nor suggested by the Berteig patent.

The Cobbley and Singh patents fail to overcome the deficiencies described with respect to the Berteig patent. For example, neither of these patents is directed to an apparatus having means for detecting movement of a movable display relative to a first surface. Rather, at best, these documents describe detecting movement of an icon within an image.

Thus, independent claims 1 and 10 are considered allowable. All of the remaining claims depend from these independent claims and are considered to recite further advantageous features which further distinguish over these documents relied upon by the Examiner. Should the Examiner have questions or additional comments regarding any interpretation of the "movable display" recited in claims 1 and 10 as an apparatus, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted at the number shown below to discuss the matter further.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: August 16, 2004

By:



Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620